

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14, 15, and 17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15 and 17 are herein amended. No new matter has been added. In light of the forgoing amendments, and the following remarks, Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14, 15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully submit that the claims are in proper form.

That is, applicants have amended the claim to recite:

a payment process unit performing a payment according to a request for payment from the user device and transmitting a lock release request for releasing a lock of the system having the retrieved address information, to the system having the retrieved address information.

The Amendment is clarifies that a system has address information and that the destination system of a lock release request is the same as the system of which a lock is to be released. As such, applicants ask that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0032601 to *Admasu et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,453 to *Andersen et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,829,285 to *Wilson*. Claims 2, 3 6-11, 14, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Admasu et al.* in view of *Andersen et al.*, in view of *Wilson* as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0147673 to *Allen*.

In regard to *Wilson*, in column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 15, it is disclosed that the owner of an illegally parked car is informed of the sum of fines by calling and telling a clerk at a parking authority office the identification number of a tire lock attached to the illegally parked car.

However, *Wilson* fails to disclose that a lock release request is transmitted to a tire lock. Fig. 1 of *Wilson* merely shows a structure for mechanically clamping a tire and a lock mechanism using a combination of numbers to set and release the lock mechanism. *Wilson* fails to suggest a tire lock having a communication facility, as recited in the independent claims of the present application.

Therefore, *Wilson* fails to suggest the feature, “transmitting a lock release request for releasing a lock of the system having retrieved address information, to the system having the retrieved address information.”

As such, applicants respectfully ask that the rejection be withdrawn and the application allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.


If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Application No.: 10/662,324
Art Unit: 3692

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.114
Attorney Docket No.: 030192A

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Dennis M. Hubbs
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,145
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DMH/rer